

did the banks have a special meeting at the White House, saying we can't allow this to happen; you got to stand in the schoolhouse door; and will they be able to motivate these Members to go back to the White House and say we stand with the President? How many times?

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that the bold leadership we have here in the House, if he vetoes this bill, which I don't want him to do, I hope he signs it, and we're able to provide the assistance to these individuals that are in all of our districts, Republican and Democrats. This is not for Democratic kids. This is for all kids, for all families, for all working people. If he does it, I hope that within the hour that he does it that we have something here on this floor, and we'll separate the Members from the followers here on both sides of the aisle.

And when we passed this bill, I know you brought this issue up, but when we passed this bill, there was 143 Republicans that voted against it, just enough to withstand. One, one over to be able to hold off a presidential override. That's a gut check there, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how many of those 143 are going to be with the President in not allowing American families to have a cut in financial aid.

I want their constituents to pay very close attention on whose side you're on. Are you on the bank's side or are you on the American people side?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can I make a point because I think this is so important. There's not been a tax increase here. This is not where the President can say, I'm going to veto this bill because the Democrats increased taxes on someone.

What we did is we shifted this money that was going to the banks and allowed them to charge students 6.8 percent. It was basically corporate welfare, and we're saying that that same amount of money that went to them is going to go to more students for cheaper loans, less interest rates, 3.4 percent instead of 6.8 percent, just a shift in the money, shift in priorities.

So what the President's basically saying is I would rather have the banks make the profit than expand student loans to more kids and more parents. Now, that's just reading the facts. Ignore our rhetoric.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. To go deeper than that, let's explain exactly what the deal is. Let's delve one layer deeper into this, explain exactly what the deal is for banks here.

We already guarantee all of these loans for the banks. That's a great deal. You tell me that I'm going to lend money to somebody and if they don't pay it back, somebody else is going to pay me back? Well, guess what, I'll probably make that loan.

But then what we did on top of it, on top of it was we gave them a cut of the loan, too. You know what we figured out? They're still going to make the loans even if you don't give them a cut of the loan. They're guaranteed loans.

They're essentially guaranteed loans. That's just commonsense.

And so as Mr. RYAN said, this becomes sort of a socialist welfare program for just a different set of people, people that are doing pretty well already. So, to me, this is just commonsense. So to a lot of people it's commonsense.

When we go back in our districts, we're hearing a lot of people talking about Iraq. People are behind the Democrats' plan to reorder our priorities there and start going after the real bad guys, but there are a lot of people struggling just with getting by every day and every week, and there are a lot of young parents who are raising young kids and looking at college costs, thinking to themselves how on earth am I going to do this.

And to think that one of the things that stands in their way is a system now that subsidizes some pretty well-off banks, at the expense of those parents and their kids, is ludicrous. I mean, frankly, I could probably sit there, even coming from a pretty fiscally conservative State like Connecticut, I could probably sit here and justify bringing in new revenue somehow in order to increase money for student aid. I think I could sell people back in Connecticut, and say, listen, we've got to put a little more into the pot and we're going take care of students who need help, I mean truly meritorious students.

We don't even have to do that here. We don't even have to make that argument. All we have to do is say listen, we've just got to shift moneys from the haves to the have-nots. That's the brilliance of this program.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I know that we're running out of time, and I think Mr. RYAN is going to move us to a few more minutes here.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to share some of those minutes with my good friends who are here, and I just want to kind of go on the point that Mr. MURPHY was making.

We have a situation now where everything that we've done I think is going to help average folks, middle-class folks, lower middle-class folks, poor folks, upper middle-class folks. Think about a family who in July is going to get an increase in the minimum wage, struggling to get by, looking to get a little boost, and they get the boost because of a new Democratic Congress and the priorities of the Speaker that we're going to implement.

And then you have a kid in school or you have young kids that need health

care, and you're going to now be able to access the SCHIP program. You're going to be able to go to more community health clinics because there's been an increase of hundreds of millions of dollars. Some more people are able to be covered.

□ 2345

Then, if you are in a State like Ohio, where the Governor, Governor Strickland, used to be a Member of this body, signed a budget that has a zero percent increase in tuition costs this year and next year, that used to be 9 percent on average in Ohio.

Now this same family has an increase in the minimum wage; they have a \$500 increase in the Pell Grant. They have student loans they are taking out that will be cut in half from 6.8 to 3.4 percent. If they have young toddlers, they will be covered under SCHIP. This family now will be a healthy, educated productive family in the United States of America, so that the 300 million people we have in this country can all be on the field competing against China for us, competing against 1.3 billion people in China for the United States, competing against 1.2 billion people in India for the United States.

Now, isn't that a good thing? Aren't these good, smart, targeted investments? I would say they are, and the benefits that we are going to yield from these investments are going to serve us for generations to come. We did a study in Ohio years ago; I think the University of Akron did the study. For every dollar the State of Ohio invested in higher education, they got \$2 back in tax money, because those people made \$40,000 a year instead of \$20,000 a year.

Now, this is a good investment. These are good investments for us to make. Long term, they are going to make us more competitive. When you look at what we are doing, what we are trying to do with stem cell research, what we are trying to do with alternative energy research, this is good stuff.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Just a quick point. During the May break, I went back and spent most of the week visiting with manufacturers and businesses in northwestern Connecticut. I could imagine what I heard was the same thing from what anybody who makes that trip will hear. It's all about workforce, workforce, workforce, that our economic salvation as a region in the Northeast, but also as a country, is not going to necessarily be, in terms of how cheap we can turn out the rubber balls, it's going to be about the quality of our product, and the quality of our production capacity.

That's all about training the new generation of workers. I mean, this money that we are talking about, it doesn't just go for students who are going to a 4-year Ivy League school. This is also money for kids that are going to community technology colleges that are being trained to be tool-

and-die makers, that are being trained to be computer technicians at the shops and the manufacturing centers of the next decade and the decade beyond.

If we are going to compete as a Nation, as you say, against China and everyone else who is undercutting us, it is going to be because we have the best trained and the most productive workforce in the country. That's what our manufacturers are screaming for, and that's what you address when you talk about putting money into higher education.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are trying to compete with 1.3 billion people in China, 1.2 billion people in India. We only have 300 million people in the country.

So it seems to me that these investments that we are making are very wise, targeted investments. There is no tax increase. But what we are saying is, is it better to make sure that the banks have an increased inflated profit margin, or is it better for us as a country, the public, to make those investments in the families and basically give these families a tax cut? These middle-class families are getting a tax cut.

If you are taking out a loan, and you have two, three, four people in your family, you have a couple of kids going to school, both parents work, you are making 60 or \$70,000 a year, and you are taking out a student loan, and last year if you took it out it was 6.8 percent and if you take it out this year and it's 3.4 percent, that's a tax cut for that family. When you go to file for the Pell Grant next year, and there is an increase of 4 or 5 or \$600, that is a tax cut for a middle-class family.

What we are saying is we have a totally different philosophy from the Republican Party. They are cutting taxes in half over the past 6 or 7 years for the top 1 percent of income earners in the country.

We are saying, and the American people will make a judgment on this in the next election, would they rather have their Congress give a tax cut to someone who makes \$1 million a year, or would they rather have us make the investments in the Pell Grant, in SCHIP, in community health clinics, reduce and cutting student loan interest rates in half and investing in alternative energy? Because that's what we are saying.

We would rather make these investments. We haven't raised taxes on anybody at all. That's the beauty of this whole thing, is we are just shifting our priorities. Instead of \$14 billion going to the oil companies and corporate welfare, we are investing that money in alternative energy research. Instead of having billions of dollars go to the banks, we are investing that money into kids and giving them more access to college education, raising the minimum wage.

The American people, and many people are seeing, we all are seeing the numbers of Congress right now. We are

not good, we understand that. But when these budgets hit, and the American people file their taxes next year, and they see there has been no increase, but yet they go to file for a Pell Grant and they see an increase in that and they see the student loan rate has been cut in half for the loan last year they had to take out for their kids and they get a boost in the minimum wage, and we are hiring thousands of scientists to do research and development through the energy bill that we passed last week, or that we will pass this week, these are the things that the American people will recognize, will understand and will see and these are going to yield long-term benefits.

One final point, the Republican Party has had their opportunity over the past 6 years to fully implement their whole agenda. They had a Republican House, huge majority, Republican Senate, Republican White House. They implemented the extreme neoconservative domestic agenda and foreign policy agenda, and the country has never been in worse shape.

Their philosophy, there is no more debate, what are we going to debate? They have had the chance to do it. They have done it. It's over. They have implemented it.

We have got the chart you showed, all the money borrowed from China, you know, all the money borrowed from foreign interests, the wages stagnant for 30 years, a foreign policy that's an atrocity right now, not a friend in the world.

So they have had a chance, and the American people have been kind enough to give us a chance, and they are going to be very proud. I understand that they may not all have felt yet what is going to come their way, but I believe that early next year, when our budget is implemented and they are having a chance to actually experience what we have done, they are going to say they are the Democrats again, and we are glad they are back in power.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I started off the last hour talking about the fact that tomorrow or the next day that Democrats, Republicans would be able to show their true colors as it relates to the redeployment of troops, something we have already voted on and the President vetoed.

I think it's important that Members point to H.R. 2956 that will be on this floor in the next 48 hours, that will say responsible redeployment of troops. Embodied in that bill will be recommendations made not only by military advisers and those that are not longer a part of this, because as you know in the Pentagon, you say something different than what the Secretary under old Secretary Rumsfeld, back in the days, when all of those things took place and you made a career decision, if you had an idea that makes sense, and said, excuse me, sir, I know you think you have all the ideas.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That seems like 10 years ago.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. But it's alive and well. What we are learning more than ever now, having hearings on Iraq, people coming forth with some of the things that have us in the situation where we are now, mounting evidence of failed policy is the justification for this redeployment of troops.

Also, the issue, as it relates to the surge again, the Democratic Congress passed a nonbinding resolution saying that we disagree with the escalation of troops, that we need an escalation in diplomacy. We needed to think smarter.

We talked about the lack of coalition just a few minutes ago. We used to hear about the coalition. It got down to the single digits. It got outright embarrassing for the administration, so they stopped talking about it.

The mounting criticism of the failed Iraq policy, not only by Members of the military, but also the American people and Members of this Congress and some Republicans in the Senate and some Republicans here in the House and definitely a number of Democrats and retired general after retired general calling for a new direction. So this is what it's going to come down to.

It's going to come down to Members taking out their card that we vote with, and they are going to have to take it out. They are going to have to find one of these meters or machines here, and they are going to have to put it in there. They are going to have to vote "yes" or "no." Do they want to vote for staying the course with the President and all of the slogans that they come up with and that they poll, or are they going to vote for a new direction and doing exactly what the American people wanted us to do? That's the question.

I look forward to coming back to the floor, not only with Mr. MURPHY, but also with Mr. RYAN, talking about the issues that we are facing. The good thing about being in the majority, and I can tell you from someone that has been in the minority before in this House, is that we can bring ideas to the floor and actually see them voted on that we have not had before.

Mr. RYAN came up with a very important point, the fact that Republicans had a number of years to do what they said that they want to do. No one stood in their way. They could have done it. They didn't do it. They had the opportunity to do it. We have asked them to be a part of that opportunity that we are working on.

I am glad we had 16 additional minutes so we would have an opportunity to get this information out.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. If I was one of those high-priced political consultants and a prospective candidate came to me and said, listen, this is what I want to be for, this is what I want to be known for, I want to stand with the President every turn, make sure we stay in Iraq for as long as we can. I think I am also going to be against children's health care insurance. I am going to try to defend the

status quo on our health care system. I think it's about right, I think we got it right.

Also, I think I also want to be against affordable college. I think I also want to fight against increases in Pell Grants and Stafford loans and all the rest. If I was that political consultant I might sort of look at my watch, look at my date book, and, you know, take a pass on that one.

You know why? It's not about Republicans or Democrats. It's what the American people are asking for; it's what the American people have been crying for. They want a new direction in Iraq. They want help with the cost of getting by every day, which certainly includes the cost of health care and college affordability. They want a place that is listening to them again instead of listening to the White House and the banks and everyone else that has had the run of this place for a while.

It will be another good week here, and I hope sooner rather than later some of our friends across the aisle join us in standing up for what the American people have been crying for for a real long time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think that is such a poignant argument to make. Our friends on the other side are basically saying we are against the minimum wage, we are against increases in the Pell Grants, we are for higher interest rates for students to take out loans to go to school, we are against stem cell research. We are against research in alternative energy. They were for offering amendments to cut the budget for all the increases we were making, instead of giving the money to the oil companies to put in alternative energy. They were offering amendments to cut that.

When we offered earlier on to strip the oil companies of the \$14 billion in corporate welfare they were getting, our friends voted against it, the extremists in their party. So you are exactly right. What are you for? What are you for?

I think we are quite clear as to what we are for on this side: lower student interest rates, more money for grants to go to college, higher minimum wage, focus on alternative energy, secure the country, 3,000 more Border Patrol agents in this country, technology to monitor biological chemical weapons on our ports, more funds for police and fire interoperability through the walkie-talkies, and able to talk and communicate with each other.

I mean, we have got a real agenda here.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am done. I just want to thank you and Mr. MURPHY for coming down tonight. I look forward to the next 48 hours, what kind of leadership will be shown on the minority side of the ball. We need them to be a part of this change in the new direction that we are moving in. But as the Democrats, with the slim majority that we do have, we are going to give

the American people what they want, and that is leadership.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate it, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MEEK, Mr. PALLONE who was here earlier, any emails from our colleagues who may be up right now, at www.30somethingdems@mail.house.gov or www.speaker.gov/30something.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BERKLEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SUTTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, July 13.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, July 17 and 18.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 17 and 18.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and July 12 and 13.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, July 12, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2400. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report for the second quarter of fiscal year 2007 as required by the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund provision in Title IX of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2007, Pub. L. 109-289; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2401. A letter from the Interim Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received June 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2402. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2007-0124; FRL-8320-3] received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2403. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Redesignation of the Richmond-Petersburg 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area's Maintenance Plan and 2002 Base-Year Inventory [EPA-R03-OAR-2006-0917; FRL-8320-8] received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2404. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Redesignation of the Hampton Roads 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area's Maintenance Plan and 2002 Base-Year Inventory [EPA-R03-OAR-2006-0919; FRL-8320-9] received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2405. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to the Texas State Implementation Plan Regarding a Negative Declaration for the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry Batch Processing Source Category in El Paso County [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-0386; FRL-8321-7] received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2406. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina: Revisions to State Implementation Plan; Clarification [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-SC-0003, EPA-R04-OAR-2005-SC-0005-200620c; FRL-8321-4] received June 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2407. A letter from the Management Analyst, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of the Schedule of Application Fees Set Forth In Sections 1.1102 through 1.1107 of the Commission's Rules [GEN Docket No. 86-285] received May 8, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2408. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Applicability of Federal Power Act Section 215 to Qualifying Small Power Production and Cogeneration Facilities [Docket No. RM07-11-000] received June 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2409. A letter from the Acting Assistant Director for Licensing, OFAC, Department of